

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

LARRY GROVES,	:	NO. 1:10-CV-735
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
vs.	:	ORDER
	:	
OHIO ADULT PAROLE AUTHORITY,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 14), to which there were no objections.

Proper Notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the Report and Recommendation in a timely manner. United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). As of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed.

Having reviewed this matter de novo pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation thorough, well-reasoned, and correct.

Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS and AFFIRMS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 14) in all respects, and DISMISSES with prejudice Petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (doc. 8), on the

ground that it is time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability in this case because under the first prong of the applicable two-part standard enunciated in Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000), "jurists of reason," would not find it debatable whether the Court is correct in its procedural ruling. With respect to any application by Petitioner to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis, the Court CERTIFIES pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore the Court DENIES petitioner leave to appeal in forma pauperis upon a showing of financial necessity. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a), Kincade v. Sparkman, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 20, 2011 /s/ S. Arthur Spiegel
S. Arthur Spiegel
United States Senior District Judge